DOCKET NO.: MSFT-2789/303543.01 **PATENT**

Application No.: 10/723,824 **Office Action Dated:** June 4, 2007

REMARKS

Status of the Claims

• Claims 1-15 and 17-18 are pending in the Application after entry of this

amendment.

• Claims 1-18 are rejected by the Examiner.

• Claims 1 and 18 are amended.

• Claims 19 and 20 are added.

Telephone Interview

Applicant's representative thanks the Examiner for granting a telephone

interview on September 7, 2007. During that interview, options were discussed that can

overcome the prior art including documentation requirements needed to pre-date the

prior art. Applicant's representative verified that pre-dating the references can be

accomplished at any time during the prosecution, if needed. Applicant's representative

also discussed the novel aspects of the invention.

Claim Rejections Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S.

Patent Publication No. 2005/0028107 to Gomes et al. (Gomes). Applicant respectfully

traverses the rejection.

Applicant amends independent Claim 1 to include the aspect that the first item value

in the first item window is related to the first sub-item value in the first sub-item window.

This relationship between the item and sub-item finds support in the as-filed specification in

paragraph 0024 as a description of item and sub-item analogous to parent and child

respectively. An example is provided in Figure 4 and the supporting text of paragraphs 0044-

0045.

The Office Action dated 6/4/2007 page 2 indicated that Gomes paragraph 0013 and

Figure 6a refer to displaying a first sub-item. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Gomes at

paragraph 0013 teaches the display of a value of the expression in a specified format.

Page 8 of 10

DOCKET NO.: MSFT-2789/303543.01 **PATENT**

Application No.: 10/723,824 **Office Action Dated:** June 4, 2007

However, as shown in Figure 6A of Gomes, the editable (bolded) portion of the "string" display does not display a "related" sub-item as recited in the pending independent claims. Although Figure 6A of Gomes allows editing of a tooltip as described in paragraph 0114, there is no discussion in Gomes of sub-item displays or lower-tier displays as recited in independent Claims 1, 8, and 13. Gomes also fails to teach editing of displayed sub-items as recited in new Claims 19 and 20.

Since Gomes fails to teach all elements of Claims 1-18 as well as new Claims 19-20, then Gomes cannot anticipate the pending claims. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 USC §102(e) rejection of the pending claims.

Claim Rejections Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 5, 11, 12, and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2005/0028107 to Gomes et al. (Gomes) in view of Applicant provided document, "Microsoft, Tiptoe Through the ToolTips With Our All-Encompassing Tool Tip Programmer's Guide" (Microsoft TipToe Through). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claim 5 is dependent on independent Claim 1, Claims 11 and 12 are dependent on independent Claim 8, and Clam 17 is dependent on independent Claim 13. Independent Claims 1, 8, and 13 patentabley define over Gomes as described above. "Microsoft TipToe Through" also fails to teach the display of an item and a related sub-item as recited in the pending claims. Accordingly, the combination of Gomes and "Microsoft TipToe Through" fails to teach all of the elements of the independent claims. Applicant submits that the stated combination cannot render obvious the pending claims under 35 USC §103(a) per MPEP §2143.03 because all elements are not found in the combination of the cited references. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 USC §103(a) rejection of Claims 5, 11, 12, and 17.

DOCKET NO.: MSFT-2789/303543.01 **PATENT**

Application No.: 10/723,824 **Office Action Dated:** June 4, 2007

Conclusion

In view of the above arguments and amendments, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §102(e) and 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejections and requests reconsideration because the pending claims patentably define over the cited art.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: October 4, 2007 /Jerome G. Schaefer/

Jerome G. Schaefer Registration No. 50,800

Woodcock Washburn LLP Cira Centre 2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891 Telephone: (215) 568-3100